



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/006,952 11/05/2001		David Kammer	035451-0169 (3707.Palm)	2782	
26371 7	590 02/21/2006		· EXAMINER		
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP			SAMS, MATTHEW C		
777 EAST WIS SUITE 3800	SCONSIN AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308			2643		
			DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006	DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
10/006,952		KAMMER, DAVID		
Exami	ner	Art Unit		
Matthe	ew C. Sams	2617		

	Mattnew C. Sams	2617					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ado	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 01 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ring replies: (1) an amendment, affice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in a e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing							
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	-					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two montl	ns of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I	out prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con		TE below);					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	24. See attached Nation of Non-Co	maliant Amandmant	(DTOL 224)				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		impliant Ameriument	(PTOL-324).				
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ul>		timely filed amendme	ant canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ii be entered and an t	ехріапацон от				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•						
<ul> <li>11.</li></ul>	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s).					
13. Other:							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Hendrey states that the "aspects of the invention relate to methods and systems for automatically and/or selectively initiating communications among mobile users in a telecommunications system that has the ability to determine a geographic location of mobile users." (Col. 1 lines 15-19), with selectively being the key word. Fig. 2 of Hendrey shows the telecommunication unit (201) connected to the telecommunication infrastructure (210), with the telecommunication unit capable of initiating connections selective to distance information (Col. 3 lines 34-36). Hendrey teaches the caller can dynamically generate a list, determine how many users to list, selectively connect to other users based on distance and have access to the "matchmaker" functions including distance information. (Col. 12 lines 38-56 and Col. 18 lines 6-14). Therefore, it is the examiner's opinion that Bork in view of Hendrey teaches combination of steps of claim 1 as seen on Pages 7-8 of the Applicant's remarks. Since the examiner views the "telecommunication unit" as encompassing a "local area computing device" and Hendrey specifically states a PDA and laptop as being examples of a "telecommunication unit" that contains a processor (Fig. 1 [101a-d], Col. 4 lines 40-53 and Col. 23 lines 42-45), the arguments regarding claims 8, 16 and 24 are considered the same as claim 1. Since the arguments regarding claims 6, 14, 22, 30 and 31 contain no new information, the original rejections are maintained in view of the further explanation.

LESTER G. KINCAID SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER